



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/824,797	04/15/2004	Masayuki Satake	UNIU79.023AUS	6655
20995	7590	03/13/2007	EXAMINER	
KNOBBE MARTENS OLSON & BEAR LLP 2040 MAIN STREET FOURTEENTH FLOOR IRVINE, CA 92614			BASHORE, ALAIN L	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1762	
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE		NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		03/13/2007	ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Notice of this Office communication was sent electronically on the above-indicated "Notification Date" and has a shortened statutory period for reply of 3 MONTHS from 03/13/2007.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

jcartee@kmob.com  
eOAPilot@kmob.com

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/824,797	SATAKE ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Alain L. Bashore	1762	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 February 2007.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 9 and 18-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 9 and 18-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)            | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .                                    |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ .  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .                        |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 30 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 30, the word "type" is considered vague and indefinite.

In claim 31, the term "comprises/is" is considered vague and indefinite.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 9, 18-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mukunoki in view of (Muys and Abe Kazuhiro et al) further in view of Mikura.

Mukunoki discloses an antistatic layer laminated on and in contact with at least one side of the optical film (may be on the surface layer or the inner layer, column 12, lines 39-40), wherein the antistatic layer comprises a water soluble or a water dispersible conductive polymer, such as polyaniline and polythiophene (column 12, lines 46-53) as defined by Applicant's specification (original claim 2). Mukunoki teaches that the antistatic layer has a surface resistance value as claimed by applicant (column 12, lines 39-42). The optical film comprises a polarizing plate (column 12, lines 31-35, film, column 19, lines 35-40), and that an activation treatment is given to the optical film (surface treatment to improve adhesion, column 12, lines 3-10).

Mukunoki fails to teach a method of manufacturing the antistatic optical film comprising the steps of applying an aqueous solution or an aqueous dispersion comprising the water soluble or water dispersible conductive polymer on the optical film; and drying to form the antistatic layer; let alone that the water dispersible polymer is constituted by micro-particles having a size of 1 gm or less.

However, Muys teaches a method comprising the steps of applying an aqueous dispersion of polythiophene (column 12, lines 34-40) on the optical film (polyethylene

terephthalate film support, column 13, lines 1-2), and drying to form the antistatic layer (column 13, line 7); and that the water-dispersible polythiophene is constituted by micro-particles having the size of 1 or less (column 5, lines 29-32), for the purpose of providing the desired coating properties for photographic film.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have manufactured the optical film of Mukunoki, by a method comprising the steps of applying an aqueous solution or an aqueous dispersion comprising the water soluble or water dispersible conductive polymer on the optical film; and drying to form the antistatic layer; and to have provided the water dispersible polymer in the form of micro-particles having a size of 1 gm or less, in order to provide the desired coating properties, as taught by Muys for photographic film and Abe Kazuhiro et al (Japanese patent publication JP10-217379) that teaches antistatic film desirable for both photographic film and LCDs (para 0042).

Mukunoki fails to teach that the adhesive layer is pressure sensitive, let alone that it is acrylic.

However, Mikura teaches that it is well known in the prior art to use an acrylic pressure-sensitive adhesive layer on an optical base film to attach to a liquid crystal cell, for the purpose improving the efficiency of the display assembling and preventing the occurrence of dispersion of quality (column 1, lines 14-24).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to have used an adhesive layer laminated on another side of a surface having the optical film of the antistatic layer of Mukunoki, in order to improve the efficiency of the display assembly and to prevent any dispersion in display quality, as taught by Mikura.

Regarding claim 26, Mukunoki fails to teach that a surface material of the optical film on which the antistatic layer is laminated is a polycarbonate.

However, Mikura teaches that a transparent protective layer excellent in transparency (column 3, lines 65-67), mechanical strength, heat stability and moisture-shielding property is made from polycarbonate (column 4, lines 1-5) for the purpose of providing the desired properties.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to have used a polycarbonate as the surface material of the optical film of Mukunoki, in order to provide the desired mechanical strength, heat stability and moisture-shielding property, as taught by Mikura.

5. Claims 30-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mukunoki in view of (Muys and Abe Kazuhiro et al) further in view of Mikura as applied to claims above, and further in view of the admitted prior art.

The admitted prior art discloses that it is known to comprise a polarizing plate of a polarized element and another element (page 1), where other elements include transparent protective films (page 2).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to include a polarized element and transparent protective film as a polarizing plate because the admitted prior art teaches surface protective films as attached to optical elements.

The admitted prior art does not teach a material for the film as further claimed in claim 30.

Abe Kazuhiro et al discloses a styrene type polymer (para 0028).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to include such to Mukunoki, Muys, and Mikura because Kazuhiro et al teaches a protective film composition for LCDs.

Regarding claim 31, the admitted prior art discloses that it is known that retardation plates require protection (page 1).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to include the optical film as a retardation plate because the admitted prior art teaches that retardation plates require protection (page 1).

***Response to Arguments***

6. Applicant's arguments filed 2-14-07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

All prior art references utilized in the rejection of record are concerned about optical property protection characteristics, which therefore make all analogous art.

Abe Kazuhiro et al (Japanese patent publication JP10-217379) teaches that antistatic film desirable for both photographic film and LCDs (para 0042).

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

***Conclusion***

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alain L. Bashore whose telephone number is 571-272-6739. The examiner can normally be reached on about 7:30 am to 5:00 pm (Mon. thru Thurs.).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Timothy Meeks can be reached on 571-272-1423. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

  
Alain L. Bashore  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1762